

US010059

Appl. No. 09/808,377  
Amdt. Dated April 20, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of February 25, 2005

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 21, and 22 remain pending.  
Claims 1 and 21 are each currently amended. Claims 2, 7  
5 through 10, and 13 through 20 have been canceled.

"Claims 1, 4-6, 11-12, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ogino (US Patent #6,762,794)." Also, "Claims 3 and 22 are rejected under 35 10 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogino (US Patent #6,762,794)." As will be discussed below, the claims as now presented are not anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of Ogino.

15 Claim 1 (currently amended) is now claiming from amongst other elements -- . . . stereo imaging means . . . including: a camera; and set of mirrors angled with respect to each other at a predetermined angle relative to a centrally located common plane intersecting said camera, each mirror  
20 having adjacent ends positioned at a common point and disposed a predetermined distance from the camera along the common plane, for directing light from an object reflected in said mirrors along a straight line of sight directly from said mirrors to the camera, for producing a stereo effect in the output of the camera --. As shown in Figure 10 of Ogino, and as taught therein, Ogino does not teach the use of a camera and a set of mirrors as claimed in Claim 1 (currently amended). For example, the mirrors 1107 and 1112 of Ogino  
25 are not arranged to have ". . . adjacent ends positioned at a common point . . ." or ". . . for directing light from an object reflected in said mirrors along a straight line of sight directly from said mirrors to the camera"; nor are the  
30

US010059

Appl. No. 09/808,377  
Amdt. Dated April 20, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of February 25, 2005

mirrors angled with respect to each other along a ". . centrally located common plane intersecting said camera," as now claimed. The mirrors of Ogino are positioned a distance from one another, and cannot possibly have ". . .adjacent 5 ends positioned at a common point." Also, it is not possible for Ogino to have his mirrors ". . .angled with respect to each other . . . relative to a centrally located common plane intersecting said camera." It is not possible for Ogino to direct " . . .light from an object reflected in said mirrors 10 along a straight line of sight directly from said mirrors to the camera . . ." Ogino actually teaches away from Applicants' invention as now claimed. Clearly, Claim 1 (currently amended) is now claiming a combination of elements 15 for a stereo camera system that is completely different than that of Ogino. According, Claim 1 (currently amended) is patentable.

Claims 3 through 5, each are dependent from Claim 1 (currently amended), dependent Claim 6 dependent from Claim 5 20 and ultimately dependent from Claim 1 (currently amended), and Claims 11 and 12 dependent from Claim 1, are each patentable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1 (currently amended).

25 Claim 21 (currently amended) is now claiming the following:

30 A method for adjusting a stereo camera system to control spatial resolution of an object of interest in the field of view of a stereo imaging means, the method comprising the steps of:

outputting at least one image from the stereo imaging means;

US010059

Appl. No. 09/808,377  
Amdt. Dated April 20, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of February 25, 2005

locating an object of interest in the field of view of the stereo imaging means and at least one of the distance of the object of interest from the stereo imaging means and the size of the object of interest;

5 automatically changing at least one system parameter which affects the spatial resolution of the object of interest based on at least one of the located distance of the object of interest from the stereo imaging means and the size of the object of interest;

10 and  
providing said stereo imaging means by further including the steps of:

15 using a camera to receive light from said object; establishing a predetermined angle between a set of mirrors, the angle being relative to a centrally located common plane intersecting said camera, and adjacent ends of said mirrors being positioned at a common point of origin; and

20 establishing a predetermined distance from the camera and the adjacent ends of said mirrors for reflecting light from said object from mirrors along a straight line of sight directly to said camera, for producing a stereo effect in the output of the camera.

25 Claim 21 (currently amended) is claiming a combination of steps for a method for adjusting a stereo camera system not anticipated or made obvious by Ogino. More specifically, Ogino teaches away from such a combination of steps, and particularly does not show or in any way suggest the steps of  
30 -- . . . establishing a predetermined angle between a set of mirrors, the angle being relative to a centrally located common plane intersecting said camera and adjacent ends of

US010059

Appl. No. 09/808,377  
Amdt. Dated April 20, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of February 25, 2005

said mirrors positioned at a common point of origin; and establishing a predetermined distance from the camera and the adjacent ends of said mirrors for reflecting light from said object from said mirrors along a straight line of sight 5 directly to said camera, for producing a stereo effect in the output of the camera. --. Accordingly, Claim 21 (currently amended) is patentable over Ogino for the above reasons, and for substantially the same reasons as Claim 1 (currently amended).

10

"Claims 3 and 22 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogino (US Patent # 6,762,794)." As indicated above, Claim 3 is patentable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1 (currently amended).

15

Claim 22 is claiming a stereo camera system that comprises a plurality of elements not found in Ogino, or made obvious by Ogino. For example, Claim 22 is claiming from amongst these elements -- . . . adjusting means comprises:

20

angle adjustment means for adjusting the predetermined angle of at least one of the two cameras; baseline adjustment means for adjusting the predetermined distance between the two cameras;

25

distance adjusting means for adjusting a distance between at least one of the two cameras and the object of interest; and

focal length adjustment means for changing a focal length of at least one of the two cameras. --.

30

Ogino does not teach the use of focal length adjustment means for changing a focal length of at least one of the two cameras. --, as called for in Claim 22. The Examiner has taken the position that the advantages of focal length

US010059

Appl. No. 09/808,377  
Amdt. Dated April 20, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of February 25, 2005

adjustment are so well known it is obvious to modify Ogino to include such focal length adjustment means. Applicants respectfully traverse. Surely if the Examiner is correct as to the advantages of focal length adjustment being 5 "notoriously well known and expected in the art," Ogino would have included focal length adjustment means in his system. The fact is that he did not. Clearly he did not see any advantage to include focal length adjustment means, nor was it obvious to him to do so. Applicants, unlike Ogino, 10 recognized the advantage of combining focal length adjustment means with other elements of their invention as claimed, in a manner not made obvious by the prior art.

The undersigned reminds the Examiner that the case law 15 is clear in guarding against the use of hindsight in reading Applicants invention into the prior art, which art is clearly not disclosing the Applicants invention as claimed. Applicants again bring the following cases to the Examiner's attention:

20                  The Supreme Court in Calmar, Inc. v. Cook Chemical Co., 383 U.S. 1, 86 S.Ct. 634, 15 L.Ed.2d 545 (1966), in which the Court warns the dangers of "slipping into hindsight", citing the case of Monroe Auto Equipment Co. v. Heckethorn Mfg. & Supply Co., 332 F.2d 406, 141 U.S.P.Q. 549 (6th Cir., 1964), where the doctrine is stated:

30                  We now come to the patented device which after all is the subject matter of this case. At the outset we take note of two well-established principles. The first is that in considering the questions of

Appl. No. 09/808,377  
Amdt. Dated April 20, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of February 25, 2005

US010059

obviousness, we must view the prior art from the point in time prior to when the patented device was made. Many things may seem obvious after they have been made and for this reason courts should guard against slipping into use of hindsight. We must be careful to "view the prior art without reading into that art the teachings of appellant's invention." Application of Spcrck, 301 F.2d 686, 689 (C.C.P.A.).

10 Applicants have reviewed the reference cited by the Examiner but not replied upon, and believe that the teachings of this reference whether taken individually or in combination with Ogino, does not anticipate or make obvious the claims as now presented. Accordingly, the present 15 invention as now claimed is free of all of the cited references.

The claims as now presented are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that 20 the claims be allowed and the case passed on to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

25   
Kenneth Watov, Esquire  
Registration No. 26,042  
Attorney for Applicants

30 Please Address All Correspondence to:  
Gregory L. Thorne, Esq., Reg. No. 39,398  
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards  
P.O. Box 3001  
35 Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510  
(914) 945-6000

12311021 AFN

Page 12 of 12